



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,503	03/08/2004	Li-Sheng Chen	21541-000310	2502

51111 7590 11/19/2008
AKA CHAN LLP
900 LAFAYETTE STREET
SUITE 710
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2454

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/19/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-INBOX@AKACHANLAW.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/708,503	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Wen-Tai Lin	Art Unit 2454	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: None.
 Claim(s) objected to: 50-55.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-9, 45-49 and 59-67.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Wen-Tai Lin/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The 112 first paragraph rejection on claims 61-63 and 112 second paragraph rejection on claims 50-55 are withdrawn .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims, as discussed in the Final Office Action, are met by the prior art. Further discussion will be provided in due course.

Applicant is reminded that:

(1) To incorporate material that is not covered in the originally filed disclosure, an explicit "incorporation by reference" statement must be made. This rule applies to any DSP data sheets that Applicant relies upon for inclusion of the Analog-to-Digital components that are featured in claims 45-47.

(2) Since the subject matter of claims 1-9, 45-55 and 59-67 is about implementing traffic management (presumably including the traditional policing, congestion control, scheduling and shaping) on a multi-core DSP integrated circuits, it is important to show (i) what traffic management algorithms are to be implemented and (ii) to what existing DSP architectures these algorithms are mapped, so as to enable an ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the invention (USC 112 first paragraph). Applicant's disclosure only teaches high-level concept about implementing traffic management on various forms of multi-core DSP architecture. There is no clear indication or showing that Applicant owned such multi-core DSP architecture and that it was implemented as an integrated circuit at the time the invention was made. For this reason, the previous office actions had construed the term DSP as Applicant's own lexicography for a type of processor because there is no clear and consistent definition for the term DSP. Likewise, without going into the details of DSP constraints for traffic management and show how those constraints are effectively overcome, it casts a doubt on the utility of Applicant's invention. It is essentially true that one can program any processing algorithm on any type of processor, if computing efficiency is not a concern.

(3) To overcome the prior art rejection and the non-enablement issue, it is not enough to show that Lee's MISD is not a DSP. Applicant is yet to show that Applicant's disclosed multi-core DSP integrated circuit exists and that certain traffic management routines have been successfully coded on such DSP architecture.